

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	
)	
The Deployment of Wireline Services Offering)	CC Docket No. 98-147
Advanced Telecommunications Capability)	

**COMMENTS OF
FIRST REGIONAL TELECOM, LLC AND
FIRSTWORLD COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

Kevin Timpane
Esther H. Rosenthal
FirstWorld Communications, Inc.
9333 Genesee Avenue
San Diego, CA 92121
619.552.8010

Michael D. Specht
First Regional TeleCOM LLC
2814 Upton Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008
202.244.1254

Glenn B. Manishin
Frank V. Paganelli
Colin M. Alberts
Lisa Anderson
Blumenfeld & Cohen—Technology Law Group
Washington, D.C. 20036
202.955.6300
202.855.6460

*Counsel for First Regional TeleCOM, LLC
and FirstWorld Communications, Inc*

Dated: September 25, 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SUMMARY /INTRODUCTION.....	1
DISCUSSION.....	4
I. THE COMMISSION MUST END THE INCUMBENT LECs’ PRACTICE OF INVOK- ING ARBITRARY SPECTRUM INTERFERENCE POLICIES TO BLOCK xDSL COMPETITION	4
II. THE COMMISSION MUST ACT NOW IN ORDER TO ENSURE xDSL COMPETI- TION ON LOOPS RUNNING THROUGH DLC REMOTE “VAULTS”	7
A. Collocation at the DLC Vault	8
B. Line Card Collocation or DLC Vault Unbundling IV	10
C. Alternative Copper Loops	11
D. SubLoop Unbundling	12
III. AN AFFILIATE OPTION FOR INCUMBENT LECs WITH PROPER SAFEGUARDS IS A REASONABLE MECHANISM FOR ENCOURAGING THE SPEEDY DE- PLOYMENT OF ADVANCED SERVICES	13
A. The Commission must ensure that ILECs and their Affiliates Remain Structurally and Functionally Separate.	19
1. ILECs and Affiliates Must Remain Structurally Separate.....	19
2. The Commission Should Not Eviscerate the Affiliate Option with De Minimis Exceptions	21
B. The Commission Must Maintain Enforcement Mechanisms Regardless of ILECs’ Chosen Avenue for Providing xDSL Services.	23
IV. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ADOPT ITS PROPOSED MEASURES FOR THE PROMOTION OF COMPETITION IN THE LOCAL MARKET	24
A. Physical Collocation Is Essential to xDSL Competition.....	25
1. Alternative Collocation Arrangements	27
2. Collocation Charges and Intervals.....	28
3. Central Office Space Exhaustion	30
B. Access to Clean Copper Loops Is Essential To xDSL Competition.....	32
CONCLUSION.....	34

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)	CC Docket No. 98-147
)	
Deployment of Wireline Services Offering)	
Advanced Telecommunications Capability)	

**COMMENTS OF
FIRST REGIONAL TELECOM, LLC AND
FIRSTWORLD COMMUNICATIONS, INC.**

First Regional TeleCOM, LLC. ("First Regional") and FirstWorld Communications, Inc. ("FirstWorld"), ¹ by their attorneys, respectfully submit these comments in response to the Commission's August 7, 1998 Notice of Proposed Rulemaking ("NPRM")² in the above-captioned docket.

SUMMARY/INTRODUCTION

The Commission has considered and requested comment on a number of proposals directed at promoting rapid investment in and deployment of advanced services, including measures to increase CLEC access to local loops and physical collocation, while also presenting

¹ FirstWorld is a rapidly growing facilities-based, integrated communications provider, offering business customers enhanced services including voice, data, Internet, video and systems integration. FirstWorld currently serves Orange County, the San Gabriel Valley, and the South Bay region of Los Angeles County with plans to expand into at least twenty-two additional states over the next several years starting in the first quarter of 1999. Although fiber optic based networks have been until now the primary focus of its business expansion, FirstWorld is aggressively deploying ADSL services as a mean of providing high bandwidth connections to its smaller corporate customers.

First Regional plans to provide complete communications solutions including local and long distance telephone services, high speed data services, Internet services and system integration to residents and small business customers that reside in multi-dwelling units ("MDU"). It intends to offer services throughout the mid-Atlantic region with an initial focus on the Washington, DC metropolitan area, and has been certified to provide telecommunications services in Virginia and Maryland. First Regional intends to aggressively offer high-speed connection services in Virginia and Maryland. First Regional intends to aggressively offer high-speed connections services throughout the use of xDSL and other technologies.

² Deployment of Wireline Services Offering Advanced Telecommunications Capability, Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, CC Docket No. 98-147, FCC 98-188 (rel. August 7, 1998) ("NPRM").

proposed rules that would enable ILECs to establish independent affiliates to offer advanced services free from the regulatory burdens of Section 251 of the Act. The Commenters commend the Commission on its efforts to promote advanced telecommunications services, and generally support the proposals presented in the NPRM. The Commenters caution, however, that the Commission must remain vigilant to repeated attempts by ILECs to circumvent their unbundling requirements to unfairly increase their already sizeable advantage in the provision of xDSL services. As is well-documented in this proceeding, ILECs have used many technical or operational grounds, most of which are either baseless or extremely exaggerated, to delay and thwart competitor's implementation of xDSL services while they catch-up and begin to offer their own xDSL services, often while ignoring the technical and operational concerns they used to stymie competitors. Rather than allow the ILECs to continue to serve as self-appointed policemen of the network and continually place roadblocks in the path of CLECs, the Commission should promptly implement the NPRM proposals that set clear directives and establish industry guidelines to more fully open local loops and collocation, which in turn will promote advanced communications services.

The comments address all issues raised in the NPRM, but focus primarily on those that are of most concern to CLECs using or planning to use xDSL technologies. In particular, In Section I, the Commenters urge the Commission to adopt interim guidelines that are simple, clear and competitively neutral for assessing spectrum interference, and requiring that ILECs no longer enforce self-imposed guidelines. Furthermore, the Commenters encourage the Commission to work with industry to establish long-term, competitively neutral spectrum management policies.

Section II provides four alternatives for addressing the technical and operational challenges associated with DLC. These alternatives include collocation of DSLAM equipment in DLCs, collocation of xDSL line cards in incumbent racks, using existing copper pairs that remain connected to DLCs, but are not being used and unbundling of ILEC xDSL cards that ILECs place in the DLC. Each of these options has unique technical challenges – similar to collocation in an end office, and methods for addressing these challenges are provided.

Section III addresses the ILEC separate affiliate proposals. In general the Commenters support the Commission’s proposals. Whatever rules the Commission adopts, the guiding principal must be that separate affiliates are placed in a comparable position to other CLECs, and should not receive unfair advantages based on their relationship with the ILEC. Consistent with this principal, the Commenters are strongly opposed to the “de minimis” exceptions and special privileges that the Commission has proposed for ILEC affiliates. These exceptions will eviscerate the separate affiliate rules, and lead to unfair advantages for the ILEC affiliates.

Finally, in Section IV the Commenters reiterate their views that the Commission must continue to strongly enforce unbundling requirements, and ensure that equal access is provided to local loops and collocation space. The Commenters support several alternatives to enhance the availability and use of collocation space including establishing additional space, requiring ILECs to provide more timely and accurate information on collocation availability, and suggesting rules to reduce the collocation costs imposed by ILECs.

DISCUSSION

I. THE COMMISSION MUST END THE INCUMBENT LECs' PRACTICE OF INVOKING ARBITRARY SPECTRUM INTERFERENCE POLICIES TO BLOCK xDSL COMPETITION

With more and more frequency, incumbent LECs are denying access to unbundled loops for the provisioning of xDSL-based services on the grounds that doing so would create “spectrum interference” and violate the incumbents’ often inchoate “spectrum management policies.” These policies are little more than unilateral declarations employed by incumbents to block competitive access to unbundled loops. Incumbents continue to make internal technology choices without any consideration of how their equipment will interfere with competitors, and then arbitrarily deny access to competitive LECs’ based on the CLECs’ selection of other (and frequently superior) xDSL technologies. The Commission has devoted a significant part of its NRPM to address whether any truth lies behind the claims of spectrum interference, indicating that it seeks objective technical standards or criteria with which to assess ILEC claims of spectrum interference. NRPM ¶¶ 159-63.

The NRPM inquires about the best way to address loop spectrum issues, specifically seeking comment on “any interference that may result from provision of advanced telecommunications capability using different signal formats on copper pairs in the same bundle.” NRPM ¶ 159. First Regional and FirstWorld believe that while the problem of “crosstalk” (*i.e.*, signals from one pair of twisted copper wires generating noise in other pairs within the same binder group) may prove to be an increasingly serious issue in the future, it is currently overstated by

the ILECs³ and is largely a red herring by which the incumbents seek to delay and hinder the introduction of xDSL services offered by competitors.

The Commission asks for suggestions on “ways to distinguish between legitimate claims that particular services, technologies, or equipment create spectrum interference and claims raised simply to impede competition,” and for “comment on whether the Commission should adopt any industry standards as the basis for national spectrum management requirements.” NRPM ¶ 160. First Regional and FirstWorld believe that these two questions are in fact closely related in seeking the answer to any actual problems that may be posed by spectral interference.

ILECs have a clear obligation under the Act to make unbundled loops available to competitors. If the ILECs want to establish a countervailing right to refuse to make loops available to competitors based on “spectrum” issues, they must first seek and obtain FCC concurrence that such departures from the Act’s obligations are legitimate and necessary. In turn, the FCC can base such a judgment only on an objective understanding of all relevant technical information drawn from a broad range of providers, manufacturers, and other experts. The Act certainly does not allow ILECs to grant themselves an exemption from its requirements based on their unilateral, often unexplained, unexamined claims of potential technical issues, which is all that ILECs have.⁴

One source of technically objective and competitively neutral guidance on spectrum management issues in the deployment of high-speed data services could be the on-going efforts of ANSI’s T1 Committee. Although the T1 Committee is not currently addressing how copper

³ See, e.g., Comments of LCI International Telecom Corp., Petition of SBC for Relief from Regulation, CC Docket No. 98-81 (filed June 24, 1998) at 3 of Appendix D.

⁴ Contrary to ILEC allegations, equipment manufacturers conduct tests on a regular basis to assess the impact of disturbers (other equipment that emits signals that could potentially lead to interference), and represent that their equipment and the services supported perform well even in the presence of numerous disturbers.

plant should be provisioned to avoid spectrum interference, ANSI could certainly assist in this task. The Commission must be careful not to adopt rules that have the effect of stymieing the emergence of true competition based on either one-sided assessments of present-day interference, or based on predicted levels of interference in the future. Nor may the FCC grant ILECs exemptions from the Act's requirements unless and until it is satisfied both as to the technical basis on which it is acting as well as to the competitive implications of its actions.

First Regional and FirstWorld agree with the NPRM's assumption that consensus and voluntary industry standards are preferable to Commission-imposed specifications. NPRM ¶ 160. On the other hand, there appears to be a clear need for the Commission to act as the catalyst for this process, for instance by active oversight of the T1 process or the appointment of a federal advisory committee to address spectrum interference standards for advanced services.

Alternatively, the evolution of technically objective and competitively neutral of spectrum management policies can be overseen by a Commission-chartered federal advisory board, modeled after the existing North American Numbering Council. This board could consist of representatives from all facets of the industry concerned with this issue, including incumbents, CLECs, equipment manufacturers, the FCC, and state regulatory bodies. Such a body could

- Oversee or even take over the on-going process of industry standardization analogous to the Commission's Part 68 registration program, for the deployment of xDSL technology using any commercially available modulation scheme
- Report regularly to the Commission on the level of customer complaints being received as a result of spectrum interference;
- Create a standardized means of reporting testing and survey results of spectrum interference levels in individual binder groups or in specific Central Offices;
- Establish an accelerated arbitration framework to rule on CLEC loop requests where the incumbent claims spectrum interference; and

- Enforce either a system of auditing interconnection requests, or a system of allowing CLEC access to facilities to conduct their own testing of specific loop bundles.

This last point merits further examination. Optimally, the Commission itself should adopt comprehensive access rules in the context of collocation and loop availability, in a way that would additionally permit new entrants to inspect and test spectrum interference levels while physically present in ILEC central offices and other facilities. Realistically, however, new entrants such as First Regional and FirstWorld are constrained by manpower limitations in their ability to contemplate physically verifying each and every claim of spectrum interference by an incumbent. Instead, a more workable approach may be to require incumbents to submit spectrum interference level reports on all interconnections with xDSL competitors, with a certain percentage randomly selected for audit by the Commission or its technical advisory committee. Whatever solution or set of solutions the Commission chooses to enact, the regulatory regime decided upon must permit consumers the maximum choice of technologies, services, and providers by enabling the marketplace, rather than the incumbents, to determine the appropriate variety and mix of xDSL technologies that can be provided over copper loops.

II. THE COMMISSION MUST ACT NOW IN ORDER TO ENSURE xDSL COMPETITION ON LOOPS RUNNING THROUGH DLC REMOTE “VAULTS”

The Commission asks commenters to address the technical and regulatory challenges created “when local loops pass through digital loop carriers or similar remote concentration devices.” NPRM ¶ 169. The use of digital loop carrier (“DLC”) technology by incumbent LECs can conflict with the delivery of xDSL-based services because, unless specifically provided for, the two technologies are mutually incompatible. DLC involves the conversion of analog signals traveling along individual copper lines to digital signals traveling across high-speed mediums, often fiber-based. xDSL technologies require the use of continuous “clean” individual copper

lines between the two devices (ATUs) that create the xDSL service. Because the DLC remote terminals or vaults utilized by incumbents interrupt the “clean” path of the xDSL-capable copper loop, the xDSL line must either be “terminated” at the remote terminal with a xDSL ATU, or directed around the DLC vault onto alternative copper lines.

Although the deployment of both xDSL-based services and DLC vaults raises significant technical and regulatory questions, the growing frequency of DLC vaults throughout the existing loop network and the low-cost promise of advanced services over xDSL-based lines require that the Commission, ILECs and competitors take the extra steps necessary to allow both technologies to succeed. Because of the nature of the technical and space limitations issues associated with the use of xDSL lines through DLC vaults, different technical solutions are required for the various network configurations that exist. For that reason First Regional and FirstWorld urge the Commission to adopt rules that allow an array of technical solutions, including those presented below.

A. Collocation at the DLC Vault

DLC vaults come in a variety of sizes, but are generally no smaller than a big doghouse, and no larger than a small shed. Inside each are one or more equipment racks filled with the line cards necessary to multiplex numerous copper lines carrying analog signals onto larger facilities, such as copper lines or fiber cables, carrying digital signals. Where a DLC vault is sufficiently large to house one or more additional racks, that space can readily be used by a xDSL-based CLEC to collocate at the vault and provide xDSL services on any incoming copper line. That is, much as the incumbent LEC’s DLC vault arrangement accepts “normal” non-xDSL equipped copper lines from the customer premises and combines them into “larger pipes” or “feeder” lines for transport to the central office, so too can a xDSL CLEC accept xDSL functioning copper

lines at the DLC vault, and use a modem/multiplexer combination or DSLAM to merge the copper lines onto a more sophisticated transport facility coded for digital signaling. Just like the incumbent, the xDSL provider can employ the available rack space to locate the equipment necessary to translate the incoming copper-based analog signal, in this case configured as an xDSL signal, into a digital, IP protocol to be bundled with other incoming lines for transport to the competitor's presence at the central office and ultimately to its Internet presence.

However, in order to be actually implemented, this technical solution requires several regulatory steps. First, as at the central office, the Commission must require incumbents to identify all DLC vaults where collocation space is available. Where space unavailability is claimed by the ILEC, space diagrams must be provided to the appropriate state commission, and inspections provided to the requesting CLEC. Second, as tentatively concluded by the Commission, NPRM ¶ 175, incumbent LECs must be prohibited from providing collocation space at a DLC vault to its advanced services affiliate unless space has also been made available to competitors. Incumbents must be prohibited from “warehousing” space for future use, particularly by their affiliates. Third, like shared cages in the central office, the Commission should require ILECs to allow shared equipment racks in their DLC vaults. Rack sharing will expand the number of competitors that a given vault will be able to sustain, while lowering collocation costs.

Remote terminal or DLC vault collocation is the most technically straightforward solution to the DLC/xDSL challenge, but requires the most space — a commodity in the control of the incumbents. Just as with physical collocation at the central office, for this solution to work the Commission must enforce national rules that prohibit incumbent LECs from employing their control of the network facilities to discriminate against competitors.

B. Line Card Collocation or DLC Vault Unbundling

In the instances where xDSL-equipped lines enter a DLC vault that is too small for CLEC collocation, or where no room is left for additional collocation, another technically feasible solution exists. It is technically feasible for a competitor to collocate only the line cards or DLC “bolt-on” necessary to terminate the xDSL signal — including converting the analog signal to digital, converting the signal to packets or IP, and multiplexing multiple xDSL copper lines onto one or more T1 lines — on the incumbent’s existing equipment rack. Because the Commission has already determined that it is technically feasible for a CLEC to request T1 level transport from the back of a remote terminal to its presence at the central office, all that is required is an unbundled “port” at the remote terminal by which the newly digitized signal can be transferred to the transport facility. By integrating the CLEC’s line cards directly into the incumbent’s rack this solution drastically reduces the demand on space associated with full collocation. However, line card collocation raises other technical and regulatory concerns.

First, in order for the line card solution to work universally, some industry-wide standards must be set regarding the interface between the line cards and the equipment rack chassis. That is, interface standards are necessary so that CLEC line cards manufactured by various equipment manufacturers will fit into ILEC equipment racks, also made by various suppliers. The Commission should initiate and lead an expedited, industry-wide and competitively neutral process to meet that requirement.

Second, management, security and maintenance issues must be addressed. Generally, the incumbent LEC remotely controls each DLC vault equipment rack by a “management card” located in the rack. In order for all parties to be confident in the performance and security of line

cards sharing a common equipment rack, procedures would have to be established for both shared remote and physical access to the vaults.

Alternatively, it is possible to consider all the facilities in the remote terminal to be owned by the incumbent, including the line cards, and require that the incumbent “unbundle” the equipment necessary to terminate the incoming xDSL line and transport it to the central office. This is a less dynamic approach as an incumbent can only be required to unbundle facilities capable of handling xDSL lines where it employs such facilities. By reserving control of all DLC vault equipment to the incumbent, this variation would simplify some of the security, management and maintenance issues associated with line card collocation, but would be limited in applicability to remote terminals where the incumbent or its affiliate served xDSL lines.

C. Alternative Copper Loops

Another solution to the xDSL/ DLC dilemma, at least in the near-term, is the use of alternate copper loops to “work-around” the DLC vaults. In many cases, incumbent LECs have added DLC vaults to the network as the result of relatively recent customer expansion in a particular geographic area. Still in place are the previously laid copper loops that serviced the area prior to placement of the DLC vault and the running of high bandwidth feeder cable. It is both technically efficient and economically viable for competitors to “bridge” their incoming xDSL-equipped lines around a DLC vault and onto otherwise dormant copper line leading back to the central office. Incumbents regularly provide themselves with this type of facility rearrangement, and in most cases, this “bridge” can be constructed with little or no service quality degradation and minimal cost to either the incumbent or the CLEC.

As with each of the other technical solutions, regulatory steps must be taken to make this a viable option. In particular, the Commission should require that incumbents provide requesting competitors detailed information regarding alternative copper loop availability and quality. Additionally, the Commission should find that access to existing alternative copper loops from a remote DLC terminal is a necessary component of unbundled loop provisioning. While the alternative copper loop work-around solution is not likely to be available in the long-term, it is an important near-term solution that has been largely rejected to date by incumbents.

D. SubLoop Unbundling

First Regional and FirstWorld disagree with the Commission that it is necessary to characterize the solutions described above as a form of “sub-loop” unbundling. *Id.* ¶ 174. Mandating CLEC access to the DLC vault is more accurately described as collocation necessary to complete the unbundled loop from the customer premise to the central office that has been interrupted by the incumbent’s DLC vault. However, First Regional and FirstWorld agree with the Commission’s tentative conclusion that incumbent LECs must provide sub-loop unbundling, as incumbent LECs too often rely on the existing sub-loop unbundling rules as an excuse to not perform technically feasible collocation and UNE unbundling tasks.⁵ Regardless of whether the Commission considers CLEC access to the remote terminal sub-loop unbundling or collocation, technically feasible steps exist to allow xDSL providers to continue to offer their advanced services despite the existence of DLC vaults. Any final rule issued by the Commission with the in-

⁵ See e.g., Comments of OpTel, Inc., In The Matter Of Inquiry Concerning The Deployment Of Advanced Telecommunications Capability To All Americans In A Reasonable And Timely Fashion, And Possible Steps To Accelerate Such Deployment Pursuant To Section 706 Of The Telecommunications Act of 1996., CC Docket No. 98-146 (September 14, 1998) (“706 NOI”) at 7-8.

tent of promoting xDSL must include one or more of the solutions described herein. If not, incumbent LECs will soon realize that simply by proliferating their use of DLC vaults, all xDSL-based competition can be effectively eliminated.

Because the network configurations and remote terminal sizes differ significantly, a variety of technical alternatives is necessary to guarantee continued competition from xDSL-based competitors. First Regional and FirstWorld agree with the Commission's tentative conclusion that "competitive LEC[s] [should be allowed to] request any 'technically feasible' method of unbundling the DLC-delivered loop, and the incumbent LEC [must be] obligated to provide the particular method requested." NPRM ¶ 171. First Regional and FirstWorld further support the Commission's tentative conclusion that "competitive LECs should not be comparatively disadvantaged by incumbent LECs regarding provisioning of DLC-delivered loops." *Id.* ¶ 172.

III. AN AFFILIATE OPTION FOR INCUMBENT LECs WITH PROPER SAFEGUARDS IS A REASONABLE MECHANISM FOR ENCOURAGING THE SPEEDY DEPLOYMENT OF ADVANCED SERVICES

In an effort to encourage the speedy deployment of advanced services, the Commission has proposed to give incumbent LECs an "optional alternative pathway" to provide advanced services, particularly xDSL services: 1) incumbents can provide advanced services themselves subject to the obligations of Section 251(c) of the Act;⁶ or 2) they can offer advanced services through an affiliate, under proper safeguards, but free from Section 251(c) obligations. NPRM ¶ 83. As the Commission has already stated, its proposal to allow incumbents to offer advanced services through affiliates would not require the Commission to forbear from the 251(c) requirements that all incumbent LECs must follow, as the Commission does not have the authority

⁶ As the Commission indicated, affiliates must still comply with Section 251(a), which contains general duties of telecommunications carriers.

to forbear from 251.⁷ Rather, the Commission's proposal creates a scheme under which an affiliate will not qualify as an incumbent in the first place.⁸ NPRM ¶ 93. First Regional and FirstWorld applaud the Commission's efforts to find a reasonable mechanism that would encourage the speedy deployment of advanced services, while simultaneously ensuring that incumbent LECs will not use their local market power to marginalize new entrants that are putting their first foot forward with xDSL and other advanced technologies.

In its efforts to create and safeguard a balance between protecting the competitive edge brought by new entrants and providing an alternative pathway for incumbent LECs, the Commission has asked numerous questions on how to craft the parameters of the affiliate option. NPRM ¶¶ 83-117. These questions illustrate the multiple considerations and choices available to the Commission as it sets the rules for the affiliate option, and accordingly, it is imperative that the Commission have a guiding principle that can direct its fashioning of the affiliate relationship.

To ensure that the ILECs' control of the "first mile" does not result in an unfair advantage for incumbents, the guiding principle the Commission should follow is this: the ILEC affiliate must be a CLEC; it must act and be treated in all respects as any other CLEC acts and is treated. As demonstrated previously, the affiliate option can be "a meaningful tool in assuring parity of treatment if the separate subsidiary is required to be a CLEC that functions like any other CLEC, both in terms of certification, and in terms of its relation to the ILECs (including negotiating interconnection agreement[s] and obtaining collocation and UNEs.)"⁹ Essentially, the only way the affiliate option can foster a competitive advanced services market that will lead

⁷ Memorandum and Order ¶¶ 69-79.

⁸ Under Section 251 (h)(1), an incumbent is "a member of NECA as of the date of the enactment of the 1996 Act, or a 'successor or assign' of such a member." NPRM ¶ 90.

⁹ Letter from Jeffrey Blumenfeld, Rhythms NetConnections Inc., to Kathryn C. Brown, Chief, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, CC Docket Nos. 98-11, 98-26, 98-32, 98-91, at 1 (filed July 24, 1998) (emphasis added).

to speedy deployment of services is if the incumbent LEC affiliate has to stand in the shoes of a competitive LEC.

The pro-competitive policies of the Act are frequently described as requiring that the ILECs must treat competitors as they treat themselves, or must do for competitors what they do for themselves. Real equality of treatment, though, is better embodied in the principle that the ILECs can only do for themselves what they do for their competitors. The affiliate structure proposed by the Commission has the potential to ensure competitive equality by requiring the ILEC affiliate to be a CLEC, and to thus ensure that all CLECs—including the ILECs' affiliates—be treated the same.

Put another way, where an incumbent's affiliate is held to the treatment by its parent of its competitors, that treatment must improve or the affiliate will suffer equally. It is to this principle that the Commission should return every time it evaluates parameters and safeguards for the affiliate option.

Even though the affiliate option will provide the incumbent LECs with the relaxed conditions that they sought as “incentive” to provide advanced services, the incumbent LECs will invariably resist the implementation of the affiliate option in the hopes of creating a solution that is as close to forbearance as possible. Thus, the Commission should reiterate its previous determination that it does not have the authority to forbear from Section 251 and that incumbent LECs' only alternative to offering advanced services under existing regulation will be the affiliate option.

Of course, the incumbent LECs are likely to argue yet again for the ability to provide xDSL services outside of an affiliate and not subject to Section 251(c), and may even claim that choosing the affiliate option would force incumbent LECs to cut-off services to existing xDSL customers of the incumbent LEC. However, while the notion of incumbents being forced to cut-off xDSL services to existing customers is one the Commission cannot support, it will never have to. The incumbent LECs can continue to offer xDSL services to existing customers, as they currently do, subject to 251 obligations, while their affiliates simultaneously launch their xDSL services. Once the affiliates' xDSL services are operational, the ILEC may switch its xDSL customers to the affiliate. Any decision to cut-off existing customers would be an ILEC decision alone, and, in a poetic sense, would be an attempt "to cut-off their noses to spite their faces."

The incumbent LECs may also make the misleading argument that safeguards on the affiliate option will compel the ILECs to abandon their intentions to offer advanced services altogether. This is similar to the threats made by Bell Atlantic and other ILECs in their efforts to have their way on their requests for regulatory forbearance. "Bell Atlantic will not deploy ADSL and other advanced technologies quickly and extensively without the relief requested."¹⁰ Just as it did with the RBOC's forbearance petitions, the Commission should reject this argument as well. In truth, the incumbents have already realized that—despite their efforts to the contrary—new entrants have made significant strides in backbone build-out and xDSL deployment, thus indicating that the advanced services market will continue to be vibrant with or without ILEC participation. Moreover, the incumbents are not able to ignore the revolutionary potential of xDSL-based and other advanced services to overshadow traditional services. Thus, while the incum

bents may cry impossibility and threaten abdication, market realities will force them either to offer advanced services through an affiliate option or through an integrated ILEC subject to 251(c). In fact, the incumbent LECs have already indicated as much by their recent efforts to tariff their ADSL services as interstate special access services subject to the Commission's authority.¹¹

Undoubtedly, the incumbent LECs will also oppose many of the safeguards of the affiliate option with the argument that provisioning advanced services in separate affiliates under the Commission's proposed safeguards would destroy the efficiencies that exist when services are provisioned on an integrated basis. To the extent that incumbent LECs rely on this argument, they are admitting that they are providing to themselves artificial advantages not provided to competitors. "Efficiencies" in this context are just another name for "barriers to entry not faced by the incumbent."

It is particularly instructive as to the true state of competition that incumbent LECs cannot imagine a worse alternative to regulation than having to offer services through an affiliate that is treated like a CLEC. In truth, incumbent LECs do not really want their affiliates to face the same battles that competitive LECs have faced during interconnection negotiations. Ever since the 1996 Act, the incumbent LECs have devoted their efforts to crafting and perfecting ways to make competitive LECs' access to the "first mile" unnecessarily cumbersome and artificially inefficient. Understandably, ILECs do not want their affiliates to have to wait their turn for collocation space when space is actually available or can be created. Incumbent LECs do not

¹⁰ Letter from Ray Smith of Bell Atlantic to Susan Ness, Commissioner, Federal Communications Commission, CC Docket No. 98-11 (March 5, 1998) at 2.

want affiliates to have their loop requests tied up in the mysterious black hole that is the Bona Fide Request process or turned away under the guise of elusive spectrum management decisions. Incumbent LECs also do not want their affiliates to encounter the ruse of incompatible standards or hear in response to a interconnection request “oh that just can’t be done.” Finally, incumbent LECs certainly do not want their affiliates to pay the UNE and collocation prices that competitive LECs have had to pay.¹²

Of course, it is precisely because ILECs will not want their affiliates to face these experiences that the Commission must require the ILECs to treat their affiliates just like any other CLEC. If the ILECs, which until now have been ensconced behind the protective walls of dominant market share, want to utilize the affiliate option, their affiliates will have to function in the world that the rest of telecommunications providers have been functioning in until now. Accordingly, the ILECs’ affiliates must go through the same certification and interconnection processes that CLECs are currently undergoing, including waiting their turn at the end of the line for collocation space. Moreover, the Commission should clarify that the ILEC affiliates will not have any priority over already existing CLECs in that process.

Requiring ILEC affiliates to function as CLECs is the only way that the Commission can ensure that ILECs, through their advanced services affiliates, offer services “on the same footing as any of their competitors,” and provide ILECs with sufficient incentive to stop subjecting CLECs to unfair and disparate treatment, as well as anticompetitive pricing practices, such as price squeezes.¹³ NPRM ¶ 86.

¹¹ Bell South Transmittal No. 476 (filed August 18, 1998); GTE Transmittal 1148 (filed May 15, 1998); Pacific Transmittal No. 1986 (filed June 15, 1998).

¹² See Letter from Teleport Communications Group, to William Kennard, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, CC Docket No. 98-11 (January 26, 1998) at 1 (citing unreasonable UNE prices).

¹³ Even while subject to 251(c)(3)(c) obligations ILECs have attempted to deploy advanced services while engaging in anticompetitive pricing practices. In separate, but related proceedings, the Commission is currently *(Footnote continued on next page)*

The effect of the Commission's rules on separation must be that the ILEC affiliate be a CLEC. It must obtain state certification through the same process as any other CLEC. It must negotiate an interconnection agreement that is then available to all CLECs. It must apply for collocation subject to the same waiting periods, and must "get in line" like any other CLEC for available space. The affiliate must obtain loops subject to the same limitations as any other CLEC.

A. The Commission must ensure that ILECs and their Affiliates Remain Structurally and Functionally Separate

There are two central questions that the Commission must address as it crafts the affiliate option: 1) How should the commission ensure that in identity and structure an ILEC's separate affiliate is "truly separate"; and 2) How can the Commission ensure that an ILEC's treatment of its affiliates is impartial, and that in practice an affiliate does not behave like an "assign" of the ILEC.

1. ILECs and Affiliates Must Remain Structurally Separate

The Commission first addresses the issue of structural separation. In doing so, the Commission lists seven separation requirements that would enable an affiliate to qualify for non-incumbent LEC status. NPRM ¶ 96. First Regional and FirstWorld agree with the Commission that these seven requirements are necessary to ensure a structural separation between an ILEC and its advanced services affiliate. Moreover, First Regional and FirstWorld agree that these structural separations should apply to all ILEC affiliates, regardless of the size of the associated

addressing the concern of CLECs that several ILECs have federally tariffed their ADSL services at retail rates that are well below the ILECs' combined charges for the UNEs and collocation needed to provide those services. BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc. BellSouth Tariff FCC No. 1, BellSouth Transmittal No. 476, Direct Case of BellSouth, CC Docket No. 98-161 (filed Sept. 11, 1998); GTE Telephone Operating Companies GTOC Tariff FCC No. 1 GTOC Transmittal No. 1148, Direct Case of GTE, CC Docket No. 98-79 (filed Sept. 8, 1998); SBC Communications, Inc. for Pacific Bell Telephone Company Pacific Bell Tariff FCC No. 128, Pacific Transmittal No. 1986, Direct Case of Pacific Bell, CC Docket No. 98-103 (filed Sept. 11, 1998).

incumbent LEC. NPRM ¶ 98. In particular, First Regional and FirstWorld would like to highlight several of these structural separations.

First, ILECs must operate independently of their affiliates. This means ILECs and their affiliates may not “jointly own switching facilities or the land and buildings on which such facilities are located,” nor may the ILEC perform operating, installation, or maintenance functions for the affiliate. NPRM ¶ 96. First Regional and FirstWorld believe that the Commission should stress and elaborate on the requirement to “operate independently.”¹⁴ As discussed infra, Section IV, the ILEC must function like a CLEC, and this requirement to operate independently means that the advanced services affiliate must acquire its own equipment and collocate its own equipment in the same manner as other CLECs and without preferential treatment.

Second, to the extent that there are any transactions between an ILEC and its affiliate, those transactions must occur on an “arm’s length basis.” Id. To ensure this principle, the Commission has proposed, and First Regional and FirstWorld agree, that the affiliates must provide a “detailed written description” of “any asset or service transferred and the terms and conditions of the transaction on the Internet,” and that description must be available within ten days of the transaction. Id. First Regional and FirstWorld also agree with the Commission that all of these transactions should have to comply with the Commissions’ affiliate transaction rules. Id., (citing Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, CC Docket No. 96-150, 11 FCC Rcd 17539, 17593 (1996)).

¹⁴ OSS—like all dimensions of CLEC/ILEC transactions—will no doubt improve dramatically, and at an accelerated rate, once the ILECs’ affiliates are forced to use it. See Application for Review of AT&T, In The Matter (Footnote continued on next page)

In addition, the Commission should ensure that crucial information is included in these “detailed” descriptions, as they will give CLECs another opportunity to determine whether they are receiving the same treatment as CLECs, which is also a structural separation requirement.¹⁵ For instance, the incumbent’s descriptions should include details of the nature of equipment that affiliates receive, such as physical makeup of the loops, and whether they have been cleansed of load coils and bridge loops.¹⁶

2. The Commission Should Not Eviscerate the Affiliate Option with De Minimis Exceptions

In addition to proposing structural separation requirements, the Commission also addresses transfers of assets between the incumbent and its affiliate. In particular, the Commission determined that the transfers may not be such that the affiliate becomes a successor or assign of the incumbent LEC. “In order not to be subject to the requirements of section 251(c), the advanced services affiliate must not be a successor or assign of the incumbent LEC.” NPRM ¶ 104. While a determination as to whether or not an affiliate is a successor or assign is a fact-based inquiry, there are transfers that will always render an affiliate an assign. As the Commission suggests, the most clear indication that an affiliate is in fact an assign would be a direct transfer from the incumbent to the affiliate UNEs that must be provided by the ILEC on an unbundled basis subject to 251(c)(3) of the Act. *Id.* Further, a wholesale transfer of facilities used to provide advanced services from an incumbent would also constitute an assignment.

FirstWorld and First Regional agree with these determinations, but have serious concerns about

Of GTE Telephone Operating Companies GTOC Tariff F.C.C. No. 1, GTOC Transmittal No. 1148, CC Docket No. 98-79 (September 19, 1998) at 3.

¹⁵ Instead of expanding collocation cages to other available spaces, ILECs have limited collocation to small areas, and then have alleged that insufficient collocation space is available.

¹⁶ Also mentioned, but not discussed are the following requirements: Third, the ILEC and its affiliate must maintain separate books, records, and accounts. Fourth, the ILEC and the affiliate must have separate officers, directors and employees.

the Commission's proposed de minimis exceptions under which ILECs can transfer equipment to an affiliate without making the affiliate an "assign" of the ILEC. These de minimis exceptions are expansive and create a gaping hole in the protective fabric of the affiliate option.

The Commission has indicated that a de minimis exception would apply to the transfer of facilities used specifically to provide advanced services, such as DSLAMs, packet switches, and transport facilities, owned by the incumbent LEC up to 6 months after the date of the NPRM. Id. ¶ 109. Moreover, the Commission has proposed to allow these transfers to take place without being subject to the non-discrimination requirement of the Act. Id. ¶ 111. ILECs cannot just take their equipment and services, place a new title of ownership on those facilities, and simply state that they are now providing xDSL services through an unregulated affiliate. If an affiliate wants to utilize the xDSL equipment of an ILEC in providing advanced services, that affiliate must purchase that equipment from the ILEC at a reasonable market rate.

The Commission has asked whether or not ILECs should be able to house, for affiliates, equipment that is transferred from ILECs to affiliates. Id. ¶ 51. First Regional and FirstWorld emphatically oppose this de minimis exception. Throughout interconnection negotiations, the ILECs have used space constraints as one of the primary tactics of resistance against entering CLECs. Those same ILECs cannot now say that they have sufficient space to house the equipment of affiliates, while all along they have adamantly argued that there was absolutely insufficient space for CLEC collocation to occur.¹⁷ In fact, affiliates should not be able to access space on the ILECs' premises until after the ILECs have met the CLECs' collocation requests previously denied on the basis of space constraints.

¹⁷ Instead of expanding collocation cages to other available spaces, ILECs have limited collocation to small areas, and then have alleged that insufficient collocation space is available.

B. The Commission Must Maintain Enforcement Mechanisms Regardless of ILECs' Chosen Avenue for Providing xDSL Services.

There are three possible scenarios that could result from the Commission's implementation of an affiliate option. First, ILECs could reject the affiliate option and deploy services themselves. Second, ILECs could establish advanced services affiliates that are truly separate and function as CLECs. Third, the ILEC could create an advanced services affiliate that benefits from ILEC partiality and anticompetitive behavior despite the Commission's affiliate safeguards.

The third scenario requires action by the Commission. While the Commission's affiliate option can remove the Section 251(c) requirements in order to incentivize ILECs to offer advanced services, the Commission should not eradicate the fundamental non-discrimination principles of the Act, and therefore must include an enforcement mechanism, similar to Section 271 of the Act, that will keep the ILECs' partiality in check. The Commission has already recognized that such an enforcement scheme might be necessary. "[I]f the advanced services affiliate derives an unfair advantage from its relationship with the incumbent, that affiliate should be viewed as stepping into the shoes of the incumbent LEC and would be subject to all of the requirements that Congress established for incumbent LECs."¹⁸ Thus, if an ILEC treats its own affiliate and competing CLECs in a disparate manner, or if an affiliate in any other way derives an unfair advantage from its relationship with an ILEC, that affiliate should be subject to unbundling and resale obligations. That is, CLECs aggrieved by disparate treatment as a result of the ILEC-affiliate relationship should be entitled to resale of advanced services from the affiliate.¹⁹ If an incumbent LEC attempts to prevent new entrants from providing competitive advanced

¹⁸ NPRM ¶ 40.

¹⁹ Resale of advanced services will be available from the ILEC, if the ILEC has not transitioned its advanced services to its affiliate.

services by giving those new entrants disparate access to UNEs and collocation, then the ILEC should have to ensure that the new entrants are able to offer advanced services by reselling the advanced services of the affiliate.

Moreover, the Commission should follow through on its intentions to make clear that, regardless of the avenue chosen, there are certain requirements for competition that incumbent LECs are obligated under the Act to follow. NPRM ¶ 84. “In this NPRM, we also propose additional rule changes that would apply whether or not incumbent LECs choose to establish a separate affiliate to provide advanced services. We propose rules to ensure that all entities seeking to offer advanced services have adequate access to collocation and loops, which is critical to promote competition in the marketplace for advanced services.” *Id.* As discussed in full in the succeeding sections, ILECs must always comply with their obligations under the Act to offer access to UNE’s, including xDSL-capable loops, and collocation in order to ensure the deployment of advanced services.

IV. THE COMMISSION SHOULD ADOPT ITS PROPOSED MEASURES FOR THE PROMOTION OF COMPETITION IN THE LOCAL MARKET

Above and beyond proposing the establishment of an affiliate option for incumbent LECs, the Commission articulates several tentative conclusions and proposed rules regarding the promotion of advanced services competition in the local market. In doing so, the Commission recognizes that true local competition rests far less on questions of investment levels or ILEC participation, but rather on the creation and enforcement of a regulatory means for ensuring equal access by all competitors to the essential facilities of the central office and the local loop. With regard to xDSL-based advanced services, the access necessary for competition is access to

unbundled “clean”²⁰ copper loops and affordable and timely physical collocation. Until parity of access to those two critical inputs is achieved, incumbent LECs will retain a far-reaching competitive advantage vis-à-vis new entrants, and the development of new services and lower prices for consumers will suffer accordingly.

A. Physical Collocation Is Essential to xDSL Competition

The Commission dedicates thirty-six paragraphs of its NPRM to considering and seeking comment on methods for providing competitive LECs access to collocation. NPRM ¶¶ 118-154. By doing so, the Commission clearly demonstrates its recognition that physical collocation is a critical component necessary for the introduction of competition in advanced services via xDSL-based technologies. First Regional and FirstWorld applaud the Commission for its detailed attention to this issue and support the recognition that physical collocation is necessary to “promote competition in the local market.” *Id.* ¶ 118.

In particular, Commenters support the Commission’s proposed adoption of “additional national collocation rules . . . in order to remove barriers to entry and speed the deployment of advanced services.” *Id.* ¶ 123. Because incumbent LECs simultaneously control access to the network and currently seek to roll-out their own advanced services, they have both “the incentive and capability to impede competition by reducing the amount of space available for collation.” NPRM ¶ 145; see Comments of DSL Access Telecommunications Alliance (“DATA”), CC Docket No. 98-146 (September 14, 1998) (“DATA NOI Comments”) at 13-15. This dangerous combination has resulted in costly anticompetitive behavior by virtually every ILEC, including flat-out denials of collocation space availability, exorbitant collocation and pre-collocation costs,

²⁰ First Regional and FirstWorld define “clean” as copper loops uninhibited by an abundance of load coils or excessive bridge taps.

and abysmally long build-out intervals. As things currently stand, vibrant participation by new entrants in the xDSL market is directly tied to regulatory relief from the incumbent LECs' iron grip on collocation space.

The adoption of minimal uniform national standards regarding collocation equipment, space allocation and space exhaustion as well as collocation pricing would significantly help to balance the existing lop-sided process by which CLECs currently seek access to the network. Without Commission-determined and enforced collocation rules, competitors seeking to gain access to ILECs central office space are powerless. Even with explicit Commission-issued collocation rules, the threat of a resale obligation is necessary to ensure incumbent compliance. See supra Section III. A combination of national uniform collocation standards, and a resale obligation, however, can have the effect of minimizing the anticompetitive leverage at the disposal of the incumbent LECs and force incumbents and new entrants to compete on price and services, and not on control of the local loop and regulatory indifference.

In particular, the incumbents' advanced services affiliate must be treated no better than other CLECs in order for the affiliate solution to work at all. Collocation is a particularly obvious area where, in the absence of clear rules, an incumbent can readily advantage its advanced services affiliate to the detriment of competitors and competition. Privileged access to previously unavailable space or facilities, or even direct and clear communication about what is or is not available at the central space can provide a winning edge in a new market. The following proposed national rules would ensure that competitors received access to collocation equal to that available to ILEC affiliates.²¹

²¹ The litany of ILEC rebuffs to CLEC equal access is long. See Reply Comments of AT&T Corp., Petitions of Bell Atlantic, US West, Ameritech, CC Docket No. 98-11, at 15 (summarizing the history of comments on this point).

1. Alternative Collocation Arrangements

The Commission suggests, and First Regional and FirstWorld support, alternative collocation arrangements designed to “minimize the space needed by each competing provider in order to promote the deployment of advanced services.” *Id.* ¶ 137. However, these measures — shared collocation cages, no minimum cage size and cageless collocation — represent only incremental increases in actual available collocation space. As discussed in more detail below, the more fundamental solution to the collocation availability problem is to ensure that all available collocation space in the central offices is used for that purpose. The alternative collocation arrangements suggested by the Commission would lower collocation costs and drive more efficient use of existing collocation space, but would do nothing to increase the total amount of that space available to competitors. That is, shared collocation allows more efficient use of existing collocation space allotments by permitting CLECs to team-up to fill-out signal collocation cages rather than each lease their own, but only partially utilize them. However, it does nothing to increase the total amount of space available to competitors — the real issue for competition over time.

Furthermore, alternative collocation arrangements, such as cageless or virtual collocation, often raise security and maintenance concerns. For many competitive LECs, access to the collocation facilities for maintenance is critical. For those competitors competing on the guarantee of high-quality, fault proof service, quick and constant access to collocation equipment is a business necessity. Thus, because virtual and cageless collocation solutions currently deny competitors full access to their equipment, they are not alternatives to traditional physical collocation. Therefore, the Commission should either not rely on those alternatives as viable options for all com-

petitors, or preferably, find that incumbents must provide new entrants with maintenance access for cageless and virtual collocation arrangements.

2. Collocation Charges and Intervals

The Commission seeks comment on other important collocation issues, such as rules for the allocation of up-front space preparation charges, and regulating collocation provisioning intervals. NPRM ¶¶143-144. The financial costs and time delays presently experienced by competitors seeking collocation dramatically burden the entry of competitors into new markets. First Regional and FirstWorld commend the Commission for addressing these issues.

CLECs currently pay as much as \$250,000 above and beyond the “standard” collocation costs to “prepare” central office space for collocation.²² There is no standard for how these costs are calculated, allocated or distributed. Incumbents are generally free to determine who must carry the economic burden for facility improvements that presumably benefit competitors and the incumbent alike. Some ILECs will not even provide a breakdown of the total dollar amount or description of what it buys. In some instances, state commissions have acted to improve matters, for example by requiring CLECs pay only for the conditioning of the actual collocation space requested by that CLEC, a vast improvement over other ILECs who charge competitors to condition an entire room, even if the CLEC will only utilize a subsection of it. *Id.* ¶143. However, the Commission should go farther by mandating that each CLEC pay only its share of any charge, and by requiring that incumbents must contract all up-front space preparation work at arm’s length with independent third-party contractors, agreed to by the CLEC requesting the build-out. To prevent incumbents from using this process to further delay collocation

²² Comments of the DSL Access Telecommunications Alliance, CC Docket No. 98-146 (September 14, 1998).

tion, the Commission should require ILECs to make available a list of acceptable contractors in each locale from which competitors can pick. By creating a competitive “market” for collocation build-out this rule should effectively reduce up-front costs to their lowest profitable price while providing incumbents the security of contracting only with known contractors.

The Commission must also work to end the incessant delays that accompany requests for collocation made by CLECs. The Commenters strongly endorse ALTS’ proposal that the Commission should “establish presumptive reasonable deployment intervals for new collocation arrangements and expansion of existing arrangements.” *Id.* ¶ 144. Incumbents currently lack any real incentive to reduce collocation intervals except where specifically pressured by state commissions via the Section 271 process.

The Commission can further speed the collocation process by requiring incumbents to consider CLEC requests and address all pre-interval issues while competitors are going through the state certification and interconnection agreement processes. This step would shave substantial time off of the delays currently experienced by new entrants. Additionally, the Commission should require incumbents to provision high speed transport links to competitors’ Internet points of presence (“POPs”) at retail intervals (currently between 2-3 weeks) rather than the intervals of up to 90 days generally offered to CLECs, and require that these be provisioned in parallel with collocation construction, rather than adding an additional 2-3 weeks onto an already too-long construction interval.

Finally, First Regional and FirstWorld vigorously endorse the Commission’s proposal to set specific maximum intervals for incumbent LECs to provide information on collocation availability and prices and to in fact provision collocation space. *Id.* Competitors regularly waste large amounts of time requesting collocation space at central offices, only to find out subse-

quently that the space required is not available at that central office, often with no indication how much space, if any, is available. There is no operational reason why incumbents could not provide regular reports to competitors listing the space availability at each of their central offices so competitors are not forced to play a guessing game every time they seek to collocate. It is unlikely that incumbents do not have this information readily available for their own internal use, and therefore should be required to distribute it to entrants.

Moreover, when it has been determined that collocation space does exist, and all pre-collocation issues have been addressed, the actual interval for provisioning collocation must be reasonable and relatively consistent. Competitors regularly experience physical collocation intervals ranging up to nine months. By creating a presumptive maximum interval for collocation intervals, the Commission can infuse predictability and fairness into this process. However, the best way to increase collocation intervals is to require incumbents to provision collocation for their advanced services affiliates in the same manner and interval as they provision CLECs, and to require that the affiliate's collocation request not be processed until after all preceding requests made by competitors have been met.

3. Central Office Space Exhaustion

The Commission proposes a number of rules directed at compelling incumbents to provide physical collocation at all available space, and where claims of space unavailability are made by ILECs, to provide a means for competitors to verify that claim. NPRM ¶¶ 145-149. The Commenters believe accurate identification of space exhaustion to be the single most important collocation issue currently faced by competitors. So long as incumbents with a clear economic incentive to deny competitors access to collocation are unilaterally in charge of determining whether or not space is "available," true xDSL-based competition is at risk.

In particular, First Regional and FirstWorld strongly support the Commission’s tentative conclusion that it should require an incumbent LEC that has denied a request for physical collocation due to space limitations to not only provide the state commission with detailed floor plans, but to allow the provider seeking collocation to tour the premises, and thus identify space that might be employed to fill the request. *Id.* ¶ 146. First Regional and FirstWorld further urge the Commission to bar incumbent LECs from “warehousing” central office space for future use, particularly by the incumbent’s advanced services affiliate, and bar incumbents from using precious central office space for “non-essential” functions, such as accounting, marketing or other tasks that could be as easily performed in other locations as in the central office. The Commission should establish a presumption that use of central office building space for anything other than the incumbent’s own switching functions and competitors’ collocation needs is not a justification for denial of collocation because of lack of available space.

Further, incumbent LECs should be required to expand the collocation options available to competitors. First Regional and FirstWorld propose that at least the following additional methods of collocation should be made available:

- Adjacent On-Site – The ILEC constructs a structure on the property of the central office and allows carriers to place their equipment in the structure and runs facilities into the central office to the MDF.
- Adjacent Off-Site – The ILEC or the CLEC constructs or rents a space in close proximity to the central office, but off the property and the competitor then obtains copper facilities effectively extending the unbundled loops from the central office to the CLECs off-site location (e.g., entrance facilities).

These collocation alternatives are either in use or are being considered in different jurisdictions, and would expand the physical collocation alternatives to competitors where space is truly in short supply.

B. Access to Clean Copper Loops Is Essential To xDSL Competition

The Commission seeks comment about the existing processes for the provision of unbundled local loops to CLECs to and in particular asks whether it should create additional new national rules regarding ILEC operations support systems, spectrum interference policies concerns and digital line carrier remote terminals. NPRM ¶¶ 151-184. Due to their importance and technical complexity, the latter two issues are addressed separately in these comments. Infra Sections III, IV.

First Regional and FirstWorld generally support the establishment of additional national rules governing the provisioning of local loops pursuant to sections 201 and 251 of the Telecommunications Act. Id. ¶ 154. Despite the Commission’s clear order that incumbent LECs must “take affirmative steps to condition existing loops facilities to enable requesting carriers to provide services not currently provided over such facilities,”²³ ILECs continue to deny competitors information about, and access to, copper loops.

Gaining access to precise information about loop availability and physical makeup is one of the most burdensome barriers to competition constructed by incumbent LECs. Incumbents regularly withhold important data regarding the availability and characteristics of loops. If asked for xDSL-capable or “clean” copper loops that carry no load coils and a minimum of bridge taps, incumbent LECs claim they are unable to provide that information. Moreover, ILECs rarely

²³ Local Competition Order, 11 FCC Rcd. at 15689-90, ¶¶ 377-79.

share the results of service tests performed on loops, and often deny loop requests with the simple but uninformative answer, “not available.”

In addition, incumbent LECs often create their own novel definitions for what it means for a loop to be xDSL-capable, and then proceed to deny or limit access to competitors based on those definitions. In doing so, incumbents ignore the loop requirements of competitors, and determine the availability of loops based upon their own arbitrary definitions. Thus, competitors can and are denied loops that do not meet an incumbent’s definition of xDSL-capable, even though the loops in question may perfectly meet the needs of the CLEC. Incumbents manipulate terms such as “loop speeds,” “loop length” and “compatibility” to find reasons not to provide access to their loops. Without national, competition-neutral definitions of loop characteristics, these anticompetitive run-arounds are sure to continue, and CLECs will continue to be prohibited from making independent determinations about whether a loop is appropriate for use.

Beyond simply refusing to provide important data regarding loop type and availability,, incumbent LECs do not currently offer operation support systems capable of efficiently distributing timely loop information. First Regional and FirstWorld further agree with the Commission that where incumbents offer advanced services via a separate affiliate, they “must provide competitors with the same access to OSS as the incumbent provides to its advanced affiliate.”

NPRM ¶ 157.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, First Regional and FirstWorld urge the Commission to adopt the regulatory approaches outlined in these Comments. The Commission should promote the build-out of xDSL networks by new entrants as part of its goal to ensure the delivery of advanced telecommunications capabilities to a growing number of Americans pursuant to Section 706 of the Act, but the market alone cannot suffice to do this in the face of the monopoly power of the incumbents. The Commission must be cognizant of the roadblocks now obstructing broadband delivery and therefore take a proactive role in guaranteeing equal treatment and fair play for all competitors if advanced services are to become truly universal.

Respectfully submitted,

FIRST REGIONAL, TELECOM, LLC. AND
FIRSTWORLD COMMUNICATIONS, INC.

Kevin Timpane
Esther H. Rosenthal
FirstWorld Communications, Inc.
9333 Genesee Avenue
San Diego, CA 92121
619.552.8010

Michael D. Specht
First Regional TeleCOM LLC
2814 Upton Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20008
202.244.1254

By: _____
Glenn B. Manishin
Frank V. Paganelli
Colin M. Alberts
Lisa Anderson
Blumenfeld & Cohen—Technology Law Group
1615 M Street, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
202.955.6300
202.855.6460 fax

*Counsel for First Regional TeleCOM, LLC.,
and FirstWorld Communications, Inc.*

Dated: September 25, 1998